DD/P

20 July 1981

STATINTL

MEMORANDUM FOR: ⬚
Engineering Division, ODP

FROM   :   ⬚   STATINTL
Chief, Policy and Plans Group, ODP

SUBJECT   :   Draft Word Processing Systems RFP
(RFP 22-81A; 31 July 1981 Version)

1. Management Staff has reviewed the draft Word Processing Systems RFP (31 July 1981 version). It clearly represents a great deal of thought and effort on the part of Engineering Division personnel. From our perspective, we find it generally on target. This memorandum summarizes our most significant comments on the RFP. More detailed comments are provided in Attachment I. Our major concerns are the following:

   a. The cost and technical evaluation procedures should be clarified (see Attachment II); the Evaluation Plan should, of course, reflect these clarifications. (The Evaluation Plan was not available for review).

   b. A further review of applicable Federal Information Processing Standards (FIPS) be performed. Attachment III is from a recently published NBS guide on the use of FIPS in acquisitions and indicate those FIPS that are candidates for word processing system procurements. The standard terminology should be used when referencing the FIPS in the RFP. (Management Staff plans to have the standard terminology on-line shortly. If you provide Management Staff with the numbers of the applicable FIPS, we will prepare the FIPS attachment for the RFP.)

   c. Forms package requirements be provided in more detail. Recent experience with the NBI system in Management Staff has demonstrated the importance of forms in the general office environment. Particularly important, we have found, is the ability of the package to handle free text in the forms mode. We recommend that the vendor be required to code, for example, three (3) unclassified Agency forms

(PAR, AWP, etc.) onto a floppy disk which
should be submitted for the evaluation; the
forms package will then be "hands-on"
evaluated for ease-of use, flexibility, etc.
This is preferable to a review of
documentation.

STAT

d. Finally, we need protection against the
eventuality that the nominal quantities
referenced in the RFP are incorrect.
Unbalanced bids with widely varying prices
depending on quantity should be excluded.
This is a complex problem but a strong
unbalanced bids clause would provide some
protection. ADP & EB should be consulted in this
regard.

2. Because of the importance of this procurement and the
visibility it has both in the Agency and marketplace, we would
like an opportunity to review and discuss with you the final
draft RFP and Evaluation Plan, incorporating these comments and
the comments of other components. The resulting final RFP should
then be sent through Management Staff for D/ODP approval. A
cover memorandum from the DD/P to the C/PD/OL giving appropriate
background and requesting procurement action to be taken should
be attached. (This memorandum should have a signature line for
D/ODP approval.) Because of the requirements nature of this RFP
a Form 2420 is probably not required.

STATINTL 3. If you have any questions on these comments, please call
me or [   ] on extension [   ] In addition, the Management STAT
STATINTL staff secretary, [   ] has a great deal of experience with
the NBI forms package and could provide you with more information
on forms requirements and on word processing requirements, in
general. Please do not hesitate to call her [   ] if she can STAT
be of help.

STATINTL

cc: C/MS

STATINTL [   ], C/DD/A

Detailed Comments on Draft Word Processing System RFP
(RFP 22-81A; 31 July 1981)

Page	Paragraph	Sentence	Comment
3	I.1-I.9		Alignment problem
12	II.1	2	Are we asking for two plans (loan-to-ownership and purchase)?
13	II.2.3	1	Change Charges to charges
13	II.2.4	1	Change Options to options
43	C.14		This clause may no longer be applicable. Please check with ADP and EB
71	E.2	1	Change "1986" to "1982"
75	7.5	1	a. Change "7.5" to "E.7.5" b. Change "FIPS Pub 1" to "FIPS Pub 1-1" c. Change "1 November 1968" to "24 Dec 1980"
78	F.3.3	1	Change "aa" to "a"
80	F.3.4.9		With this open wording the contractor must include the cost of enclosures in his bid to protect himself. Can we provide a maximum DB level?
81	F.3.5	1	Change "ASCll" to "ASCII"
81	F.3.6	Last	Change "be removable" to "be easily removable"
			Note: Systems life cost should include cost of "X" diskettes per machine. Many vendors require the use of special diskettes that are up to three times as expensive as commercially available diskettes. (e.g., NBI).

Page	Paragraph	Sentence	Comment
82	F.4.1	Next to last sentence	Garbled
83	F.4.1.5	2	Change "me" to "be"
83	F.4.1.7		Our experience has indicated that this is a very important capability. (Our offices do far more forms work than imagined). Especially important is the ability to handle free form text fields (with wrap around) etc. We should provide three forms (e.g. AWP, PAR, etc.). Vendor should code them using their forms package and provide the disks for evaluation. Vendor should also provide a fixed price for coding a form.
83	F.4.1.9		By whom, operator or vendor?
85	F.4.3.3	Heading	Change "Aligmnent" to "alignment"
86	F.4.3.12	1	Change "the" to "to"
86	F.4.3.14	2	Out of context
88	F.6	1	We want TEMPEST, if available, I presume.
88	F.6	1	Change "may be required" to "will be required"
90	G.2.2.2	1	Change "requlations" to "regulations"
91	G.2.6.3		Is this replacement requirement realistic. Four failures and 16 hours is more reasonable for machines on a lease-to-ownership plan. (Our NBI's would have been in and out regularly by your standards). For a straight purchase aren't we stuck?

Page	Paragraph	Sentence	Comment
92	G.2.10.2.1		Three years (?) Three years after the last delivery (?) Reconcile with 60 month systems life.
92	G.2.10.2.1	Para. Number	Change "G.2.10.2.1" to "G.2.10.2.2"
95	G.5.2	3	Change "Software Performance" to "G.5.3 Software Performance"
95	G.5.2	Last sentence	Section Q?
99	12 & 13		13 should be a new paragraph
100	II.3		See cover letter
101	II.4.1	3	Change "effecting" to "affecting"
101	II.4.3	2	Change "training, maintenance" to "training, hardware maintenance"
101	II.4.4	1	(a) Insert "with appropriate Agency security clearances" after "servicemen" (b) Change "always provide this" to "provide for the length of this contract this"
119	4.B	2	Change "Provde" to "Provide"

Comments on Cost and Technical Evaluation Criteria
(Draft Word Processing Systems RFP; 31 July 1981)

1. Are we requesting lease (pg. 100, para. II.3) or lease-to-ownership (pg. 12, para. II.1)? Do we not require a plan which will provide lowest overall evaluated systems life cost?

2. A system life of only 60 months may force the vendor to lease machines in months 48-60 to provide lowest cost. A system life of 96 months is probably realistic

3. How will the "lifecycle cost" in the cost evaluation be computed?

   a. What is an "optional requirement system" (pg. 87, para. F.5)? Is it an "enhanced system" (pg. 100, para. II.4)?

   b. Which options are on the 25% of the system that will require 1 or more options and which systems receive these options (pg. 87, para. F.5)?

   c. Which 25% of the systems will require communications interfaces (pg. 87, para F.5)?

   d. A date should be chosen in each fiscal year for delivery.

   e. What about residual value?

   f. Choose a nominal contract award date for costing purposes (so all cost evaluations start in the same month).

   g. Presumably costing will be based on the quantities on pg. 87, para. F.5.. This should be clarified.

   h. Provide an estimate of maintenance calls outside of PPM per WP for use in the life cycle lost determination.

   i. Provide an estimate of floppy disks, ribbons, etc., per WP per year because supplies are often available only from the vendor (e.g. NBI for floppy disks). Have the vendor provide prices for these supplies and include in the life cycle cost.

j. Have the vendor price the coding for the forms package of X forms initially and Y additional forms annually.

4. The quantities on pg. 87, para. F.5 are estimates, we need language to protect the Government if actual quantities procured are significantly lower or higher than these estimates (cumulative or by fiscal years). A strong unbalanced bid clause would provide some protection (see ADP & EB).

5. The technical evaluation should clearly state that a vendor that doesn't meet the mandatory requirements will not be considered for award. My understanding is that only among those that do satisfy the mandatories will the scoring described on pg. 100, para. II.4.1 and pg. 101, para II.4.2 be performed. Is this correct?

ADP ITEM	APPLICABLE STANDARDS	FIPS
Text editors	Code for Information Interchange (ASCII)	1
	Implementation of ASCII	7
	Subsets of ASCII	15
	Code Extension Techniques in 7 or 8 Bits	35
	Graphic Representation of Control Characters of ASCII	36
Word processing systems	OCR Character Sets	32
	Code for Information Interchange (ASCII)	1
	Implentation of ASCII	7
	Subsets of ASCII	15
	Code Extension Techniques in 7 or 8 Bits	35
	Graphic Representation of Control Characters of ASCII	36
	Bit Sequencing of ASCII in Serial-By-Bit Data Transmission	16-1
	Character Structure and Parity Sense for Serial-By-Bit Data Communication in ASCII	17-1
	Character Structure and Parity Sense for Parallel-By-Bit Data Communication in ASCII	18-1
	Synchronous Signaling Rates Between Data Terminal and Data Communication Equipment	22-1
	Synchronous High Speed Data Signaling Rates Between Data Terminal Equipment and Data Communications Equipment	37
	Magnetic Tape Cassettes for ASCII (3.810 mm (0.150 in) Tape at 32 bpmm (800 bpi), PE)	51
	Recorded Magnetic Tape Cartridge for ASCII 4-Track, 6.30 mm (1/4 in), 63 bpmm (1600 bpi), PE	52
	Guidelines for Describing Information Interchange Formats	20*
	Guideline for Selection of Data Entry Equipment	67*

27